REMARKS

Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate therein the recitation of claim 3. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claim 2 has also been amended to recite that the silver halide photographic photosensitive material is adapted for imagewise exposure followed by development processing, and that the photosensitive material prior to processing with a processing solution comprises the at least one compound represented by formula (I). Support is found, for example, at page 80, lines 4-6 of the specification. See also Example 1, which describes preparation of a silver halide photographic photosensitive material containing a residual-color-reducing agent represented by formula (I), which photosensitive material is then subjected to light-exposure followed by development processing.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 2 and to refer to the compound represented by formula (1).

Claim 13 has been amended to recite an image-forming method which comprises processing an imagewise exposed silver halide photographic photosensitive material adapted for development processing with a processing solution. The photosensitive material prior to processing with a processing solution contains a dye chromophore multilayer-adsorbed on silver halide grains and at least one residual-color-reducing agent having at least one aromatic ring or aromatic heterocycle in its molecule. Support is found, for example, at page 80, lines 16-24, and particularly lines 19-20 (said photosensitive material may or may not contain the residual-color-reducing agent).

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 14 have been canceled.

Support for new claim 15 is found, for example, at page 32, lines 4-9 and in specific examples shown at pages 61 to 79 of the specification.

Support for new claim 16 is found, for example, by reference to (13) and (14) at page 13 of the specification.

Support for new claims 17-19 is found, for example, at page 87, lines 22 to 25 of the specification.

Entry of the amendments and review and reconsideration on the merits are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,632,594 to Nakai et al. Nakai et al. was cited as disclosing processing solutions containing residual color reducing compounds within the scope of formula (I) of present claim 2.

In response, claim 2 has been amended to incorporate therein the recitation of claim 3, to thereby obviate the foregoing rejection. Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 2.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,153,364 to Goswami et al. The Examiner cited Goswami et al. as teaching treating solutions containing residual sensitizing dye-reducing compounds within the scope of the rejected claims, where Ar in the formula of Goswami et al. is preferably a naphthyl group.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being met by U.S. Patent 6,686,134 to Suzuki et al. Suzuki et al. was cited as disclosing processing solutions containing residual sensitizing dye-reducing aromatic compounds within the scope of the rejected claims.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakai et al., Goswami et al. or Suzuki et al., further in view of U.S. Patent 6,361,932 to Parton et al. and U.S. Patent 6,117,629 to Yamashita et al. Yamashita et al. and Parton et al. were cited as disclosing silver halide grains having multi-layer adsorbed sensitizing dyes. The Examiner relied on Suzuki et al., Goswami et al. and Nakai et al. as disclosing photographic elements containing dye sensitized silver halide grains, which photographic materials are processed with solutions containing residual sensitizing dye-reducing compounds having aromatic groups within the scope of the rejected claims.

As a basis for rejection, upon contact with the subject processing solution, the Examiner considered that the photographic material would contain the claimed residual dye reducing compounds after treatment, while still retaining light sensitivity prior to fixing.

In response, both product claim 2 and method claim 13 have been amended to recite that the imagewise exposed photosensitive material prior to processing with a processing solution contains either the at least one compound represented by formula (I) or at least one residual-color-reducing agent having at least one aromatic ring or aromatic heterocycle in its molecule, to thereby distinguish over the cited references where a residual-color-reducing agent is said to be introduced into a photosensitive material upon contact with a processing solution.

As described at page 6, lines 17-24 of the specification, and citing U.S. Patent 6,153,364 to Goswami et al., incorporating a residual-color-reducing agent in a processing solution causes problems resulting from deterioration of components due to long-term use of the processing solution. The present invention can improve the above-noted problems by incorporating a residual-color-reducing agent into the photographic material instead of adding such agents to a processing solution.

As described at page 80, lines 4-16 of the specification, it is preferable to incorporate the residual-color-reducing agent into the silver halide photographic photosensitive material. In this case, the effect of reducing color-remains can be achieved. Furthermore, by incorporating the compound into the photosensitive material, only the residual color of the silver halide photographic photosensitive material in which a dye chromophore according to the present invention is multilayer adsorbed, can be improved.

Because none of the cited references discloses a photosensitive material containing the claimed residual-color-reducing agent prior to processing with a processing solution, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are neither anticipated nor obvious over the applied prior art, and withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yamashita et al. and EP 277509 (EP '509).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parton et al. and U.S. Patent 5,068,171 to Morigaki et al.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,555,305 to Vargas et al.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,192,646 to Merkel et al.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita et al. or Parton et al. both in view of Vargas et al. and Merkel et al.

In response, claim 2 has been amended to incorporate therein the recitation of claim 3, to thereby obviate the foregoing rejections. Claims 1, 5 and 11 have been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 2.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests a photosensitive material containing a compound represented by formula (I), where A_1 and A_2 each are a substituted or unsubstituted naphthyl group.

Withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of claims 2, 4, 8, 12, 13 and 15-19 is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the Examiner believes that it may be helpful to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number indicated below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Abraham J. Rosner
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 12, 2005